THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

Vol. 3.] THURSDAY DECEMBER 12, 1918. [No. 8.

The Hindu Message stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.
Postage As. 13. Extra.
Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, The Hindu Message, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

VASISHTA'S HERMITAGE.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Here shone the dreaming peace of hermitage
Where great Vasishta rapt in Godward thought
Away from towns where souls are sold and bought
His mind on life's deep problems did engage.
He helped the sceptred kings with counsel sage
But their large gifts of wealth he never sought.
To all his Pupils true he gladly taught
Sweet blessed truths from heart's unwritten page.
Here when a mighty king with earthly power
Full vain of all his pomp of war array
To seize the heavenly cow did try in war,
Vasishta's staff in that most fateful hour
Did hold sin's arrogance and might at bay,
And he above that storm shone like a star.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 12 DEC., 1918.

His Majesty's French Visit.

There has yet been on earth among men no greater advocate and promoter of international amity and good-will than His Gracious Majesty our King-Emperor. Though he certainly owes his inspiration to his illustrious father, his career as the head and representative of the British Empire shows that the promotion of harmony and sympathy is his special mission to the Empire of which he is the heaven-appointed ruler; and in the transformation which the world is to undergo in the near future in consequence of the world war now fairly over, these world-principles of human nature in its loftier and deeper reaches are surely destined to play a conspicuous part. The present universally respected President of the United States has frequently placed before the civilised world his proposal for the formation of a League of Nations in order to prevent the barbarity of war among civilised men, and his views and sentiments have been echoed by the foremost representatives of Great Britain and France—Mr. Lloyd-George and M. Clemenceau, their respective Prime Ministers. Politicians everywhere of every creed and grade, and the Press throughout the civilised world have always welcomed Dr. Wilson's proposal with enthusiasm. The world of civilised humanity has now been compelled to recognise that the old system of Alliances and Ententes has not been for the good of the human race, and that it must be displaced by something more comprehensive and all-embracing. The World-War has given a new aspect to the entire order of the universe consisting of the relations between peoples, states, and communities. As civilised men and their leaders realise this fact more and more, all states and nations will unfailingly perceive that their common interest is *Peace*,—not war, and will combine into a larger whole,—*viz.*, the international community or League of Nations. The beginning of the formation of such a league or community comprising all civilised men (and by implication all others) has already been made by the recognition of the principles of international law and the establishment of international courts. All writers on international law have laid down that it is not law in the true sense of the term as it has *no force* behind it and consequently international tribunals cannot compel the attendance of parties or enforce their awards. Still, we have witnessed the fact that, where nations and communities are so inclined, they accept even disagreeable decrees of international arbitration courts and proceed to give effect to them,—witness, for instance, the *Alabama* award. Moreover, great jurists have combated the notion that states—*i. e.*, individual states—at least are not based on the principle of force. Whether or not there is such a thing as a "real will," "good will," "rational will" among men, we shall find that there is such a thing as a common will, express or implied, and that, without being based on it, no state or political community can subsist for any measurable period of time. If we apply this idea to our present topic,

—*viz.*, international law,—we shall find that, even if international law can have no basis of force to stand on, it can stand on the basis of a common will among all civilised states and men. That is if *all* civilised men and states are determined that the principles of international law shall govern the mutual relations of states, there will be no difficulty in conferring on it the character of a true law. For, then, the force needed as a sure basis for law will exist and can easily be applied against any party who sets at naught a decision of the properly-constituted tribunal.

From the remarks we have made above it will be easy to see that the work of the leaders of civilised mankind in the immediate future is to find a basis for the creation of an International Alliance among the nations, great and small which flourish today and are not fallen beyond redemption. His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor has, it may be said, already begun this great work by his visit to France. The splendid reception given by the President and People of the great Republic may be said to be the forging of the first link in the chain which is to bind the world's peoples into the future Peace League of the world. King George dwelt on the manner in which the British Empire and the French Republic had borne manfully the burdens and horrors of more than four years of war and devastation by the barbarous and implacable enemy, and how this had brought about "a union of hearts and identity of interests and a trust which would ever grow closer and contribute materially to the consolidation of peace and advancement of civilisation." Nothing could more truly indicate the trend of the future policy of the world's future than our King-Emperor's gracious words spoken on this memorable occasion. For, hitherto, the boasted civilisation of the Western world was one which never deserved the name. It was a civilisation based on the primeval forest law of combat, and therefore was no better than the triumph of the *bete humaine*, of the animal in man. It was a dismal gospel which the late eminent scientist, Charles Darwin, proclaimed when, improving on the words of the Bible, he uttered the ten memorable words :—"Marry, multiply, let the strongest live, and the weakest die." King George is the first to take advantage of the present armistice to proclaim a nobler ideal for the future of humanity. "The union of hearts and identity of interests" which he proclaimed at Paris was certainly not meant to be confined to the mutual intercourse of the British and French peoples, but to be extended to the civilised world. Even the Germans, if they showed themselves in the future to be capable of better things than the brutes they have been so far, might enjoy the privileges of admission within the magic circle of civilisation. But, at first, they must remain beyond the pale, owing to the blood-thirsty and predatory instincts which they have displayed in the War and which have marked them out as savages worse than brutes. Their redemption must come, of course, from within, and it will be long in coming. But the world cannot wait till then, and our gracious King-Emperor is the first to inaugurate the new movement for union among mankind.

We must not forget that His Imperial and Gracious Majesty is here taking

up no new role or mission which the cessation of war has forced on his attention. From his accession to the British throne, he has proclaimed to his people throughout the dominions in his Empire the urgent need of a closer union of hearts and cultivation of broader sympathies than ever before was found possible. He has visited the people of all the British Colonies and every part of this Indian continent, and his mission everywhere has proved the harbinger of peace, concord, and advancing prosperity. We, his Indian subjects, owe our present hopeful and cheerful prospects entirely to his gracious proclamation of a policy of "sympathy" with our aspirations after national self-respect and self-government. Since his memorable visit to India our record has been one of continuous progress, and now the time of fruition seems close at hand. The same has been the case with the British Colonies throughout the globe. They and we in India owe it largely to King George that the part played by both in over-throwing the enemies of the Empire has been so efficient, heroic, and honourable. Hence, we unhesitatingly declare that His Imperial Majesty is playing no new role when he pleads for a larger and closer "union of hearts and identity of interests" between the French and the British peoples. The old rivalry and opposition between the two peoples has now receded into the dreamland of a distant past. King George's noble and illustrious father was the first to endeavour to teach the French to recognise their identity of interests with the British. His efforts happily succeeded, and the present visit of King George has been happily described as a "solemn consecration" of the Alliance which the illustrious Edward helped to inaugurate. King George's Mission to France, however, is also, destined to prove the inauguration of *a world-wide movement* of peace and harmony of which we have already spoken, and hence is an event of the utmost importance in the future history of humanity,—an event whose significance can only be seen in the light of events occurring not only in the present crisis as a sequel of the war now ended, but of those which will occur both in the near and remote future.

Democracy in India, and Elsewhere.

A fear is expressed in some quarters that the introduction of a democratic reform—even on the moderate lines outlined in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report—will result in bringing into power an oligarchy, and one, too, which will be solely and wholly Brahmin in composition. It is chiefly to guard against such a ruinous possibility that those non-Brahmins who follow the lead of Dr. Nair and Rao Bahadur Theagaraja Chettiar want communal representation. Similar views are held by the organ which represents the interests of the Anglo-Indian community: *The Madras Mail.* Some vocal members belonging to the communities known as Depressed Classes have also made a demand for communal representation. For ourselves, we are of opinion that there is a wide demand for communal representation everywhere in the Presidency, and we think that the Government will be wise in recognising it and should thereby secure the success of their Reform Scheme. Moreover, we

hold that communal representation or representation by castes and sub-castes is not at all inconsistent with the democratic principles which are in the ascendant all over the modern world. It is because we hold this view that we are ourselves in favour of communal representation being granted in order to satisfy the prevailing public feeling in its favour. At the same time we do not share the fear expressed in some quarters that, if communal representation is withheld, the democratic changes about to be introduced under the reform scheme now on the anvil, will bring into power in the Provincial or Central Government a form of oligarchy different from that prevailing under the forms of democracy prevailing in Western lands. Those who say that a Brahmin oligarchy will be placed in power when the reforms are introduced know well that no such thing will happen, and we have frequently shown in these columns that such a thing as an exclusive Brahmin oligarchy has never held the reins of government in India, and has never been possible in India and it is a sheer impossibility at the present day when education is not a monopoly of any class or caste in India. We hold that, if some kind of mixed oligarchy composed of representative men from all communities is placed in power, it is nothing to be wondered at. For, no democratic state can exist which can altogether free itself from the association of oligarchical elements in its government. In fact no government can exist in a state, however democratic in its basis and aims, which is not carried on by some form of oligarchy.

The accepted principle of democracy is contained in the famous statement of the American Declaration of Independence that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed." It has no doubt, been held that, even in autocratic, aristocratic or oligarchic governments, the consent of the governed—implied, if not express—necessarily exists. For, as Sir William Temple holds, "power arising from strength is always with those who are governed, who are many." If the many are dissatisfied, they can always overthrow those who wield authority as a last resort; and so those few or the one who wield authority must necessarily in more or less degree, consult the will of the governed. The difference between democracy and other forms of government lies in the following features. *First,* the consent of the governed is *implied* in the latter, while it is *explicit* in avowedly democratic government. *Secondly* government in democracies is likely almost always to exercise its powers justly and so as not to favour any party or section of the people.

The question for consideration now is whether the principle of equality exists and is carried to its fullest extent in the democratic states, or is even possible. Have all the inhabitants of democratic states an equal voice in carrying on their affairs? We hold that such a thing does not exist, nor is it possible. While there is no doubt the people possess power, they cannot *all* wield power *equally* in any democratic state. The *exercise* of power must necessarily be vested in a few, and all cannot *equally* participate in the *work* of government. Such equal participation can only exist in communities which are—to use the words of a well-known living writer,—"minute, primitively

simple in their conditions, and isolated." As communities increase in size and the conditions of life become more complex, the work of government must get entrusted to those who possess trained powers of judgment so as to provide for the meeting of all exigencies that might arise. This will become more and more true of the complex societies of the present and future of civilised humanity. Actual power must necessarily vest in an organised few who alone possess the trained judgment needed to deal with situations as they arise in accordance with the manner in which they comprehend the relation of cause and effect existing between those situations and the measures needed, or taken, in dealing with them. Such organised groups of men who weild power and carry out the measures needed to carry on the functions of the state are *necessarily of an oligarchical character*. Even in the smaller bodies connected with trade and business, it has been found necessary to bring into existence an organisation more or less oligarchic in character for the efficient conduct of affairs,—for example, trade unions, sailors' unions, &c. No doubt syndicalism is attempting to substitute the principle of direct action by labour for representation in the carrying on and control of industry. But syndicalism is still more or less of an aspiration. In actual practice, organised syndicalism is unable to avoid having recourse to oligarchical elements of some kind or other in order to effectuate its aims. The actual conduct of business as an organisation must be carried on by the few who take part in it. This is only more clearly exemplified in the administration of states ; it can be easily exemplified from the history of the working of democratic states, both in Europe and America. In revolutionary France, when Robespierre and his followers ruled, the Paris Clubs set up what was but a practical tyranny. In the United States, the Negroes, emigrants, and illiterates still are prevented by various means and devices from exercising the franchise. The representative system of government in England has remained and must remain an elective oligarchy, in spite of the democratic franchise, lately extended by the legislature to women. Moreover, we have to take into account the system of checks and balances under which the Cabinet is enabled to exercise the entire power of the Government—to remain accepted as what has been happily termed the *hyphen* of the Constitution. Lastly, in the United States, the judges are made the ultimate tribunal for deciding what is truly valid under the Constitution and so take their place above the Legislature. Their decision stands till the holding of a Constitutional Convention. This latter—the Constitutional Convention itself—is an oligarchical device which acts as a check on democracy. Many other such devices exist, and are unavoidable in the practical working of government.

The lesson we in India have to learn is that some kind of oligarchy must actually exercise power under the most extended system of popular franchise that can be devised The newly educated *classes* must be invested with a large share in the administration. Even if the Brahmins are excluded from it, the various non-Brahmin Castes and communities will supply the men who will constitute the governing oligarchy. Hence, we have no hesitation in

condemning as unscrupulously mendacious the statement that the granting of the reforms proposed will be of no advantage to the Indian *people*, but only to a Brahmin oligarchy is the creation of the Anglo-Indian or Nairite imagination. Under the "wide" system of franchise contemplated by the authors of the Reform Report, the *people* of India alone will influence the measures of the Government, and they alone will determine the personnel of both the Indian executive and the Indian legislature. And all who, out of personal or factional motives, oppose the inevitable granting of the power of self-determination to the Indian people are not only bound to fail, but will stand condemned as slavish knee-crookers or unprincipled self-seekers at the bar of history.

Notes and Comments.

Mr. W. S. Lilly writes in *The Nineteenth Century and After* for September 1918 as follows regarding the precepts of Jesus:—"It does not seem to be so much as suspected that admonitions addressed by the Master for the guidance of the disciples who followed his wanderings in Palestine may be inapplicable to the conditions of Modern European life; that the regulations governing a small communistic community in Jerusalem nineteen hundred years ago may not suffice for the conduct of those who in the twentieth century London bear the name of Christian—in many cases, it must be remembered, with slight warrant." After all, the truth is dawning on the minds of Christians that Jesus spoke only for his disciples, and not for mankind at large. Many Christian writers and critics of the Bible have declared as spurious the passage in which Jesus admonishes his disciples to preach his doctrines and precepts to all men. We firmly believe that no set of doctrines or precepts can be suitable to all men for all time.

*
* *

The Indian sages take their firm stand on the doctrine of *Adhikara*. Doctrines and precepts differ for the same people according to their status in life at different times, and for different people, also, even though they may live at the same time, for the same reason. Moreover, Hindu sages hold that men in different ages or epochs are different in their inclinations and environments, and even for such differences they have provided in their Dharma regulations. Of course, we should not suppose that there are no absolutely true Dharmas at all—true for all men and for all time. If the grace of the Supreme Personal Deity is to be gained, it can only be gained by *Bhakti* or *Anuraga* (unlimited love of Isvara). If the Supreme Self transcending all personality is to be realised, it can only be done through the methods of meditation practised under the instruction of a Guru leading to the dissolution of mind (*Manolaya*),—and so on.

*
* *

We must not be understood also as saying there are no universal, necessary, or absolute truths of the moral order in Christianity. What we mean is that Christianity is to be distinguished from the precepts of Jesus. Jesus never claimed to teach all mankind, but proclaimed that his mission was to the lost sheep of Isreal. As time went on, the fathers and guides of the Christian Church borrowed from Greek or Roman thinkers and moralists whatever truths or precepts they wanted for the development of their religion or ethics. They also drew freely from the natural reason of man whatever precepts or doctrines they needed in the new circumstances in which they found themselves. Mr. Lilly claims that vengeance against wrong-doers is one of the eternal moral laws founded upon natural reason, that punishment is involved in the transgression of the moral law. The Hindus are saved from this logical conclusion of the reason by their doctrine of Adhikara. The natural or the rational man will certainly resort to vengeance or punish-

ment as the law of life for him. But the spiritual man who seeks liberation from the bondage of samsara will rather adopt the rule of mercy and compassion for all beings—towards men and even animals. According to the *Yoga Sastra*, where a Yogi practices universal compassion for all beings, even brutes will lose their natural craving for the flesh of their prey. The moral law varies for the higher man and for the lower. This is known as the relativity of the laws of ethics. So long as the higher laws of ethics are not practised in the relations of men towards each other, the earth must remain a veritable hell as it has been for centuries on centuries in history.

* * *

An English ecclesiastical dignitary writes as follows regarding religions :—"Diversity is not only a sign, but a spring of their life. The lower a religion the more apparent are its uniformities; the higher a religion the more conspicuous its diversities. Necessarily so. Because the lower it is, the less thinking it provokes and requires; the higher it is, the more thinking it encourages and stimulates. And wherever thinking enters diversity follows." The various forms of Vedic religion are all due to hard thinking on the problems raised and solved by the Vedanta. Badarayana's aphorisms known as the *Sariraka Mimamsa* are the sublime results of the application of the highest dialectical power ever reached by a human mind to the solution of the riddle of existence as solved by the Rishis of the Upanishads. The Bhashyakaras of the various schools and their followers who became devoted to the promulgation and defence of their systems (or *siddhantas*) have applied their powers of reasoning—at the highest altitude ever reached by the human mind—to the production of immortal works which are, and will remain, a joy for ever. The diversities of Vedantic doctrine even now enthusiastically followed only prove that the religion of the Veda is nonpareil as a living source of inspiration for the human spirit in India.

* * *

We have also a corresponding diversity in the organisation, discipline, and administration of the Mutts which have become devoted to the promulgation and defence of the several schools of Vedic religion in India. Any attempt to destroy this diversity either of discipline or doctrine or even to reconcile them by some artificial method of explanation might check freedom of thought and spiritual enthusiasm and easily prove a retrograde measure without any corresponding social advantage.

* * *

But should the exclusiveness extend even to such matters as social relations among Brahmins? Such exclusiveness does not seem to have always existed, or at least to have been carried to the extravagant lengths which have become a normal feature of the Brahminical society for several centuries past. It has resulted in destroying the unity of Brahmin society and the union of hearts which alone can give us strength to cope with the many social troubles which are looming on the horizon or have already begun to distract our minds in a manner unknown before. We think, also, that many persons belonging to each of the Vedic schools among us delight in their exclusiveness from an egotistic sense of superiority derived from the idea that they have a monopoly of the true doctrine concerning reality as revealed in the Upanishads from "the satisfaction of our lower human nature in thinking we ourselves are always right and others who differ from us always wrong." After all, our divine sources of spirituality are the same, and the true doctrine of the Veda and Vedanta can be one only. This consideration must teach us humility and freedom from prejudice towards those from whom we differ. Neither the Srutis nor the Smritis contemplate any social separation among the Brahmins originating

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

in language, sectarian interest, ecclesiastical authority, and so on. The time has come for all Brahmins to endeavour to meet socially on a common platform so as to promote the practice of Sri Krishna's divine command that all his devotees should join together in the loving worship and glorification of Him.

* * *

Communication between certain persons similarly constituted without resorting to the use of sense-organs and by the influence of mind on mind is what is called *telepathy*. It may never become a matter of scientific treatment and precise determination for the simple reason that no experiments are possible in matters which concern persons who bring with them into the world personal peculiarities or developments which defy all established methods of inquiry. Moreover, it is by no means certain that the establishment of methods of communication of mind with mind will necessarily add to the sum-total of human happiness. In Europe and America, many gifted men have discovered the secrets of nature and have applied them to the invention of various wonderful products, machines, &c. Has the world been made happier or the reverse? We think there can be no doubt about the answer,—especially to those who have witnessed the perpetrating of barbarities on an unprecedented scale during the war just closed by peoples professing to be the most advanced and civilised in the world. There is always a danger in prying into nature and obtaining a knowlenge of its secrets by men who have not controlled their lower passions and emotions. It is this knowledge that induced the ancient Hindus to value more the methods of *Yoga* or controlling the tendencies and modifications of the mind than the methods of controlling nature. It is well-known that the Bhagavad-Gita distinguishes between men of *Daiva-sampat* and men of *Asurarsampat*. It is only to the former that the secrets of nature and the machinery invented by those who possess a knowledge of them can be safely entrusted. The Germans who have shown themselves to be possessed of Asura-sampat with their barbarous ideal of *Kultur* have used their knowledge of scientific laws and their powers of mechanial invention only to make the world and existence on it a curse to mankind. We cannot, therefore, hail with pleasure the advent of a day when telepathy will become a recognised and established means of communication between mind and mind. For, then, the tyranny of man over man will be enhanced a thousand-fold more than what it is today, and life on earth will become a veritable hell.

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA II.

(continued.)

13. Let us now take up the method of the analysis of our daily consciousness— The method is called the method of अन्वयव्यतिरेक (similarity and difference). Every day we pass through the three *avasthas* (states of consciousness) known as जाग्रत्, स्वप्न, and सुषुप्ति (the waking state, the state of dream, and the state of deep sleep). Each is marked off from the next by a well-marked line of difference, and the realm of each excludes the realms of the others. But disparate and disconnected as they are, there is a unifying principle of consciousness which by its inter-linkings of experience and memory connects them like an all-embracing sea connecting the disconnected islands of the ocean. On waking up after deep sleep the sleeper says सुखमहमस्वाप्सं न किंचिदवेदिषम् (I slept happily and I knew nothing then). Thus the ever-wakeful witness साक्षी is there watching the dance of life in the waking state, the reflex activity of the mind in the dreamful state, and the sheath of deep nescience that soothes and renews the tired elements of mind and body in the state of deep sleep. Hence it is clear that there is a principle in man that is separate

from the daily procession of the three states. Life is a mere succession of days. Therefore if the soul is beyond the limitations of the day it is equally beyond the limitations of life and death. In the famous पञ्चदशी Sri Vidyaranya says well:

शब्दस्पर्शादयो वेद्या वैचित्र्याज्जागरे पृथक् ।
ततो विभक्ता तत्संविदैकरूप्यान्न भिद्यते ॥
तथा स्वप्नेऽत्र वेद्यं तु न स्थिरं जागरे स्थिरम् ।
तद्भेदोऽतस्तयोः संविदेकरूपा न भिद्यते ॥
सुप्तोत्थितस्य सौषुप्ततमो बोधो भवेत्स्मृतिः ।
सा चावबुद्धविषयावबुद्धं तत्तदा तमः ॥
स बोधो विषयाद्भिन्नो न बोधात्स्वप्नबोधवत् ।
एवं स्थानत्रयेऽप्येका संवित्तद्वद्दिनान्तरे ॥
मासाब्दयुगकल्पेषु गतागाम्येष्वनेकधा ।
नोदेति नास्तमेत्येका संविदेषा स्वयंप्रभा ॥

14. Again it is a part of the human experience that vague memories of past births cast their shadow or radiance athwart the present state of our being. Keen observers who do not go through life as a mere place of business or of amusement have realised and recorded this fact again and again. The most supremely beautiful statement of this fact is that which occurs in Kalidasa's world-famous stanza in *Sakuntala*:

रम्याणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान्
पर्युत्सुकी भवति यत्सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः ।
तच्चेतसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं
भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरसौहृदानि ॥

I may mention here a few famous passages in English poetry bearing on this vital and precious truth.

Wordsworth says:

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
The soul that rises with us, our life's star
Hath had elsewhere its setting
And cometh from afar.
Not in entire forgetfulness
Nor in utter nakedness
But trailing clouds of glory do we come."

Tennyson says in *In Memoriam*.

"The days have vanished, tone and tint,
And yet perhaps the boarding sense
Gives out at times, he knows not whence,
A little flash, a mystic hint."

In one of the most beautiful sonnets in the sonnett-sequence entitled *The House of Life* D. G. Rossetti says:

"O born with me somewhere that men forget
And though in years of sight and sound unmet
Known for my soul's birth-partner well enough."

(*To be continued.*)

"Nations by themselves are made."

A study of the conditions in Germany immediately before the war and during three years of it suggests many analogies with the existing conditions in India at the present date. And we do not feel like apologising in presenting our readers with some rambling thoughts induced thereby. The details of German life and character are taken from Mr. Gerard's book 'My four Years in Germany.' Mr. Gerard was the late American Ambasador at the Court of Berlin.

***

The Political Bankruptcy of the Central powers of Europe now stands confessed. And yet were we blind to the sequel now in the making and soon to follow we should be culpable of misjudging a people whose imagination is poetic and whose passions are strong. At the very outset let us confess that the people of Germany were in the wrong and deserve all the punishment that Heaven in the fulness of Time has been pleased to visit upon them through the well-merited success of the Allied Arms. Slaughter of the innocents, violation of women, enslaving of the Belgians, torpedoing merchant vessels and slandering well-meaning nations and the proud display of a total disregard of all international arbitration, these are crimes to be fully atoned for. Those that sow the wind must reap the whirlwind; It is but bare justice. Yet still those who conquer but to save, have to remember the exact position of the people of Germany before the war.

The German who was not by birth of the higher castes of Germany could never aspire to be anything higher than a common soldier. His voice was not heard in the Council of the State. Both the Church and the State worked for the maintenance of the Supremacy of fighting powers, Military and Naval. The Social system is made to adjust itself to the procrustean bed of militarism and even school children are brought up under careful supervision to a reverence and awe of the military heroes past and present. Women bear and share the titles of their husbands and a young woman cares more for an impoverished army officer with a "Von" before his name and prefers him to a Dr. with ten thousand Dollers a year. There is a regular "Rat" ladder in Germany *i e* of titles and poor benedict finds himself eternally nagged if he fails to become some kind of "Rat."

Every department of social and civic Life is directly under Government control and almost all the Executive officials are from the militant Prussian Class. Royalty can invite themselves to any function. The Railways except some 60 miles are all state-owned; the Prussian officials could only be tried in Special aod Secret Courts. Of course criticism is almost impossible and if some of the new Social Democrats are occasionally heard in the Reich-Stag, it is only a cry in the wilderness. Again the Newspapers are mostly controlled if not owned by the State. And many papers are the property of Concerns like Krupps who are interested in War and the manufacture of munitions. There is no such thing as a real public opinion or a National Conscience in Germany,

The system of decorations which brings all sorts and conditions of men together once in a year, has a superficial semblance of democracy. On this occasion the cook who has invented a new dish and a hero who has submarined an enemy craft, a butler of 25 years' faithful service and a dioplamat who has added a Colony to the Empire, all rub shoulders with one another. But the appearance is decietful. For, blue ribbons are given at the sacrifice of votes. All except the Industrial peoples of the Town and the Peasants in the Country, both struggling to make both ends meet, are caught by this fever of 'Ordesfest.'

To the outsider the German is a very brave man but in Germany the common German works through fear. This is due to the land system of Germany which tends to bias in favour of the military ruling class. There is no law of primogeniture and no peasant-proprietorship. Under the system of 'Majorats' large landed estates are owned by the high caste proprietors who find it easy to get the maximum of work for the minimum of wages from their tenants, who but sometime before had been the born serfs on their lands. The hard work of the women in the fields brutalises their nature and produces more wage-earners thus driving wages down. The apparently kind system of 'Insurance against unemployment' often enslaves the men to the land practically as serfs.

The list of self-made man in Germany is small indeed. It will be seen from what has been said about the various kinds of people in Germanv that there are only two classes from whom any movement for the liberalisation of the people can originate. The kaufman class (*i.e.* the merchants) generally have the advantage of foreign travel and know something of the outside world. If they occasionally feel the shortcomings of their political system they more often feel the enormous profits, that low wages and long hours ensure them and it is no wonder that they keep their own counsel. The Social Democrats have not met with any success, as they demand the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of a republic as part of their Programme.

The war then was the work of the military autocracy and the aftermath of war affects all the classes; but there is no escape from it. Willingly or unwillingly, consciously or unconsciously, those that have set at naught the fundamental laws of all civilisation can expect little mercy or consideration. It is not merely the thirst of vain-glory or the pride of victory which denies Germany any opportunities of further lawlessness, but the supreme necessity to succour small nations all the world over in their efforts to realise their own ideals, unhampered and unafraid. The time has come when vested interests must make room for national enterprise and when the genius of every nation must be allowed free scope for self-expression and so fulfill its own destiny,--with the one pro-

viso that in so doing, it encroach not the pre-determined liberties and rights of other nations. In short, 'Competition' has failed in practice and the only hope for mankind is in Co-operation.

* * *

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HATE.

Germany began by envying and hating Russia in the early period of the War. Hate was cultivated in Germany as a noble passion; something like the present hate against the Brahmin in India. Then the formula came to be "Gott Strafe England" and "America" was afterwards added. Lissauer's Hymn of Hate procured him "The Red Eagle of the Second Class." (We fear India is not without a parallel). Hate like some other things comes home to roost. Neither a man nor a nation can live by abuse alone.

If there is any one lesson of the European War which is more important than any other for us to remember it is this: that no nation can escape the effects of its own evil deeds. Whether only some party in power did work the evil, whether under compulsion only the unthinking masses made common cause with the ruling classes and killed and butchered their fellowmen, whether it was only that smug snug self-satisfaction supported the war from the safest, softest easy chair, the responsibility for the crime none can escape. War for War's sake, the profession of arms as a national industry has been weighed and found wanting.

* * *

PEACE AND WAR.

Now that the war is over, we have to remember what Kidd has forcibly taught us in his Social Evolution namely—The subtle influences of peace do more to kill a nation out than even the most sanguinary wars. Byron tells us of the luxuriant harvest which grew out of Waterloo and so may a poet prophecy the double crop which poor Belgium might reap sometime hence; but the instruments of denationalisation that sneakingly creep in the midst of the rose gardens of our youth—smoke and drink, the self-seeking profiteering of our merchants, the unfeeling speculation of our Zamindars, the corruption of those in power and authority, the shameless hunting for honours and titles which characterise the public life of those that ought to know better, the partialities of potentates for persons of their own caste and worse than all, the *belief* that such a state of things is only natural, these are the enemies we have to contend with. And these are not easily put down; no shots from machine guns, no poison gasses, no submarinism avail here. But conscience, the voice God, must fight the battle alone. To ignore the existence of evil is not to cure it; if the dicease is allowed and its diagnosis only forbidden, the odds are against national well-being. We need not discuss whether the evils are of eastern or western origin. Enough to know that the evils are there and that they should be removed.

The crying need then of the moment is that the people should begin to '*think*'; at present there are so many leaders in India that it is a matter of some difficulty to find out whom it would be well to follow. It is a wise nation that knows its own leader. One person is convinced that as soon as the caste system is given up (what is there to give up) the millennium would come. Another is equally certain that by increasing school fees and teaching English phonetics, the result can be achieved, with better success. A third thinks that the regeneration of India is to be ensured only by chimney-smoke and the three and a half per cents. A fourth is of opinion that all this is unnecessary; only we should drive away all the Brahmans from India, and the thing is done. But every one of them agrees that their individual pay should be increased and if possible that he should be placed at the head of his special department—for the benefit of India. Let it be remembered there is no hypocrisy here—none at all. A long unbroken association of ideas explains the case. The interest of the country is the interest of the people. Ergo my own self-aggrandisement is adding to my country's wealth. To be, even in own's own self-estimation, the Saviour of one's own country would be worth something, were the phenomenon a little less common!

* * *

THE PILOSOPHY OF ACTION.

But wishing is not having. Strife must go before enjoyment and if the truth be told, striving in itself contains an element of joy. Striving, doing, achieving, these are the only steps for rational government. Self-determination, if merely a political cry faintly echoing the amorphous inarticulate mutterings

of modern Europe, the plea for self determination must fail in India as elsewhere. For after all the form of government is not the real thing. But the *men* who make the nation—it is they that count. Freedom may be a license to make a beast of oneself—to drink, debauch and go to the devil. But this is no government, much less self-government. We are not playing with the word; when vested interests are sacrificed for common good and when habits which make a man a brute are rendered impossible, when the strength of social opinion acts in itself as a deterrent of venal habits, when life and property of persons are safe-gaurded without at the same time building temples for mammon worship—it is then and then only that self-government can be achieved. But can mere legislature do it? No. Therefore must the people do it for themselves. And the best government therefore would be that which enables the people to achieve their own purer ideals most freely and most easily. There is no royal road to national integrity and no short-cut for race-regeneration. We should steadily keep on ever-watchful for the snares of flattery, insinuation and self-interest, into any of which we may easily fall if we but swerve from the strait path of rectitude and self-sacrifice. The man of the world who thinks himself a perfect psychologist that could play upon the feelings of others what stops he pleases, may at last find himself in the wrong as did the Ex-Kaiser. Nations are not built upon political expediency but on the solid virtues and capacities of the men who make them up. We must therefore live our simple and unostentatious life of utter hardihood. Deaf to the insinuations of our enemies, more so to the cajolings of our foolish friends, we must set our hearts upon our ideals and work for them. No passivity, no heartless apathy is of any use. For not by favour or fortune are nations maintained, but by enduring qualities of head and heart, by their preparedness against surprise, by their sympathy with the fallen, by the love of justice and fair play, by their inherent capacity to strive after the highest ideals, by the power of reverence—not by pampered effiminacy or by circumstances of material wealth, not by the lying tactics of long-headed diplomats but by the living faith of the people in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. When religion permieates our every-day life in our hearts and homes and becomes our daily bread, then only are we a nation. *Alpha.*

Olla Podrida.

As already anticipated by me, the Mahomedans of Madras conducted their public meeting of protest against the bill introduced by Mr. Yakub Hasan in a sober and orderly fashion. The wreckers of the Hindu meeting not content with breaking up the meeting are adding insult to injury by raising a huge outcry in the Madras papers about "printed falsehoods" perpetrated by calling the meeting a public meeting and say that they have saved the reputation of Madras by refusing to allow the meeting to go on under the name of the public of Madras. These are days of free speech, are they? No. These are days of free speech by rowdy and braggart majorities and of tearful muzzled silence of minorities.

*
* *

In a recent lecture by Professor T. B. Rajagopalan on 'Democracy' he said that the ideal of democracy was to make each individual "a law unto himself." So the new gospel is that each man is to be a law unto himself. But the old gospel was that each man was to be a realisation of the law of God. That was certainly the higher ideal. Now comes Mr. C. Jinarajadasa and tells us of a *divine democracy.* He tells us that caste should go but the *asramas* should remain. So of Varnasrama-dharma he would grant pardon to *asrama* but would hang *Varna.* For which act of clemency we as in duty bound shall ever pray for more lectures from his mellifluous tongue.

*
* *

The American naval programme—which is a purely peace programme (?)—is that America should complete by the end of 1920, 350 submarine chasers, 112 patrol boats, 40 submarines, 50 mine sweepers, 25 tugs, 5 dreadnoughts, and 350 destroyers. So each nation must be armed to the teeth and must spend upon armaments its last pie of money got from the world by

the spoliations of commerce and exploitation—For what purpose? Why, only to preserve the peace of the world. The only means to live and let live is to kill and die.

***

Russia is chaos. Thousands are dying by the roadside. "Numbers of horses are dying of starvation in the streets of Moscow. The people continue to eat horses and dogs." What effect this interment of horses and dogs in men's stomachs will have on their minds we cannot say. But we shall wait and see.

***

Sometime ago there was a strike of the street sweepers in Holborn (London). So women were pressed into the service to do the work. The strikers and their womenkind pelted the substitutes with mud and succeeded in keeping the streets dirty and filthy. The Editor of *New India* asks: "While such disgraceful things like pelting women with mud go on in London, which our rulers would like us to believe is the centre of civilisation, are we to be blamed if we shrug our shoulders and prefer our own civilisation, the product of countless centuries, to the recent and obviously crude brand we find in many western countries?"

***

We also are improving fast. The Editor of *New India* says in the issue dated 29th November that one named Kamala says that there is a Society for the protection of the rights of wives and that a resolution is to be passed by it that man should cook and woman should agitate. The Editor is much agitated by it and says: "In these days positively anything may happen." He then proceeds with charming inconsistency to advocate Mr. Patel's bill. We shall ask him in his own words: "Are we expected to understand that the ideas of our Editor may take formidable shape sometime in the future, and drop with violence on an astonished India?"

***

Why should not man cook and woman agitate? Man has known cooking and is even now cooking. Woman has been delivering certain lectures and has never forgotten the fine art of agitation. Only her audience will be larger in numbers. Man has been playing with firearms and now it is the fire's turn and it will claim his standing before it as a cook.

***

Mr. C. Tejpal pleads in the same issue of *New India* for crematoria and undertakers and says that these will co-operate with Patel's Bill to kill caste. So Patel's Bill is a kind of crematorium and is similar to the work of an undertaker. Truth will out sometimes at least.

***

These are not the only evidences of Indian progress. The Women's Indian association at Kumbakonam believes that the time has come for women in India to take their place in politics and it demands the Franchise Committee to include women in the scheme of reforms. Vellore and Coimbatore also have demanded the same at the tongue's point. So also Egmore. *Abala abhivardhani Samaj* also has thundered forth. Why do women call themselves *abalas*? Let them put an *s* before the word. Chittore, Ootacamund, and Delhi also have similarly bombarded Lord Southborough.

***

The Boy scouts and others have celebrated the fortieth birthday of G. S. A. at Madras, Madanapalle, Tirupathur, and other places for doing something which no one else has done in India—delivering public addresses and writing articles on education. The Boy scouts have made also six important announcements. Did you read them?

***

Mrs. Hope is the rival candidate to Mr. Asquith for the constituency of East Fife. It is a case of forlorn hope, I suppose.

SCRUTATOR.

The Inter-Caste Marriage Bill.

Indian Marriages.

The proposal which forms the basis of the Hindu Marriage Bill, introduced by the Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel in the Imperial Legislative Council has, not unnaturally, evoked a storm of protest from amongst the orthodox. The position is one which is not

generally understood, since what most people, unacquainted with Indian social institutions, imagine is that this reform is mainly concerned with the legitimisation of marriages, as between one Hindu caste or sub-caste and another. Were this, the social aspect of the question, the most prominent consideration, Mr. Patel's Bill—or for that matter Mr. Basu's—would not have raised the storm of protest it has done. What is actually involved is the difficult and intricate question of inheritance under Hindu law; since such a measure would practically undermine the whole system in existence. Hindu laws of marriage and inheritance present a wide diversity, varying from matriarchal system which has been in vogue from the earliest times in Malabar, to the strictest form of the patriarchate, based on what is generally known as the joint family, prevailing in its most rigid form in Southern India. Both these extremes are essentially communal in their basis, founded as they are in the one case on the *tarwad* or matriarchal group, in the other of the joint family. The question involved in most of the measures proposed by Social Reformers for the legitimisation of marriages, as between one caste group and another, strikes at the basis of this communal arrangement; and it is here that the root of the trouble lies. As things stand to-day there is nothing to prevent a Hindu of one caste from marrying into another—or for that matter out of Hinduism altogether—but the contract must be made either under the rites of the Arya-Samaj or Brahma-Samaj—or alternatively under the Civil Marriage Act. But all such contracts involve virtually a renunciation, so far as the offspring of the union are concerned, of all rights under the Hindu law of inheritance. In fact marriage under the Civil Marriage Act involves an explicit renunciation of such rights. There is nothing which orthodox Hindus or Mahomedans resent more strongly than any attempt to interfere with their religious usages; witness the great volume of opposition evoked in connection with the Age of Consent measure; and more recently in connection with Mr. Yakub Hasan's Bill for the registration of Muslim marriages and divorces.

The stand taken by the orthodox community in Madras is based on the theory that marriage among Hindus is essentially a religious sacrament and not a civil contract, and that the proposed reform, "in the garb of an innocent and permissive measure, aims to cut at the root of the sacred and immemorial institution of caste; and it is altogether unnecessary and uncalled for and mischievous in effect, and is sure to give rise to numerous difficulties, religious, social and legal, besides disturbing the peace of many a Hindu home and giving room for unequal and objectionable alliances, not in the least conductive to the happiness or well-being of the married couple or their kith and kin, and they, therefore, solemnly and emphatically protest against the Bill being passed into law." This, one may say without fear of contradiction, represents the view of the vast majority of Hindus, including also many who in other respects would generally be considered Progressives. A point especially made by Dewan Bahadur Ramanujam Chetty at yesterday's meeting at the Gokhale Hall was that the proposed measure is calculated, in effect, to enable people who, by their own voluntary acts, have placed themselves outside the pale of orthodox Hindu society, yet "to claim all the privileges of Hindu society." "What these men primarily aim at,' he said, "is the ancestral property;" and this is exactly what orthodox Hindus object to. That there is another side of the question is obvious from the vigorous protest made by the Social Reformers at a previous meeting referred to, when the latter insisted that the resolution opposing Mr. Patel's Bill should not be described as emanating from "the Hindu citizens of Madras" but from "some Hindu citizens of Madras." We are inclined, however, to think that these reformers are very much in the minority. The bulk of opinion is against reform in this direction, and whatever opinions social theorists may hold, we fancy that the task the reformers have set before themselves is one beyond their power, in the near future at any rate. As we pointed out the other day, the time is not yet ripe for such a reform, and he would be a bold legislator who would face the enormous complications resulting from an attempt to reconcile the contemplated innovation with the already appalling complexities of the Hindu law of inheritance.

The Madras Mail.

Gleanings.

The Complacent English; or, Why He is Happy.

An Irishman's Notes on the Saxon Temperament.

The Englishman has a passion for liberty, and cares little for equality, fraternity, or any of the ideals which are the glory of the French intellect. He is, indeed, so entirely without the faculty of ideas that even his feeling for liberty has never become an idea or a doctrine; he has no intellectual cognisance of it; it is merely his habit, a something which from long use has grown into him and become part almost of his physiology: it is in his blood and in his bones, and remains by him always, keeping vigilant watch and ward. But it is for himself alone; it is not for universal application; it is not his philosophy. To me, a Frenchman is always like a student; either as he is when he works diligently at his studies, or as he is when he plays truant, breaks away from discipline, and defies his teachers. An Englishman, on the other hand, is a person untutored, who has never been either to school or to college; he has neither the attractiveness of the diligent student nor the excesses of the rebel student. He is still almost what he was when he came first from his Maker's hands.

He is given to much self-contemplation in its various forms of self-complacency, self-examination, self-condemnation, and self-exultation. He talks continually of himself; deprived of that subject and of what is akin to it, he is a silent man. Not to be the subject of conversation, neither to be praised nor abused, is to him a disconcerting experience. He is not vain; it is merely that his occupation is gone. The Americans are too busy with their own growing fortunes to remember his existence, and for that reason he is, in New York, either so gentle and sad or so peppery and quarrelsome as to be quite unrecognisable. He is no longer himself. In his own country he is an unwearied egotist. When pleased, it is with himself; when displeased, it is still with himself. With his neighbours he is often sulky; yet his worst quarrels are with himself, and therefore the hardest to reconcile. His variations are variations, not of ideas, but of mood. The French live in a ferment of opinion; it is their atmosphere—man contending against man with noise, vociferation, oratory, and much action and movement. Among the English there is always the silence of inward communing, the stillness of a people overweighted with meditation. In France, new schools of art and movements in literature are the triumphs or—it may be—eccentricities and freaks of the logical process. In England such movements mean the welcome or unwelcome emergence into light of a new species. French impressionism was ushered into the world with loud argument. Turner's art was something inscrutable and mysterious, the expression of a temperament that did not argue and looked for no converts. Under any strong excitement, the Englishman withdraws into himself as into the security of his own home. The Frenchman, on the contrary, gets away from himself into the world of friends and ideas and starts a propaganda to embrace the world.

The Frenchman is a gentleman; his is the finer instinct, the finer training, and the finer intelligence; wanting these, the Englishman has to be taught by the cumbrous methods of reward and punishment; he learns under the whip, and becomes more like a well-trained animal than a reasonable human being. Yet such is the blessedness of mere habit—even he ends by doing quite cheerfully what he learned most unwillingly. Legality, hard-and-fast rules that must not be broken, and that are interpreted in the narrowest spirit, depressing enough in all conscience although they be, are to him an enjoyment and a matter of incessant thought; since, if they circumscribe, they also define and secure the spaces of personal liberty. They are his substitute for ideas, and, if they excite no enthusiasm and are some of them admittedly bad, all the same, he makes it his glad duty to obey them. Outside these laws, he is intractable and inclined to be surly, quarrels with his neighbours, and is jealous and suspicious of his rights as a dog with a bone. Yet the Englishman is not unhappy. He has the happiness of a perpetual self-complacency.

M. A. B.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.